

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 93 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #336
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 16 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 336

Today's Topics:

Codeless Technician (3 msgs)
Neighborhood watch groups
No Frills License Application
Restrictions on antenna hght

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1993 10:28:42 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!ucivax!news.claremont.edu!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!
sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin.jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

<edit>
: Some people may choose to devote their time to other skills.
: Why should they have to waste (in their opinion) time on CW?
 <edit>
: since CW MUST be passed to gain HF access, the ARRL must believe
: CW is "the sole measure of an amateur's quality". Other wise,
: why the all important "CW: pass it or no HF access" rule?
 <edit>
: Perhaps you should look at ALL the questions under the context
: of my first two paragraphs: WHY IS CW WEIGHTED MORE THAN ANY
: OTHER ASPECT OF AMATEUR RADIO??

<edit>

I've edited out a few questions that I may be able to shed some light upon.

Once upon a time, all radio was amateur, there were no regulations and licences. Then governments decided it was useful. Amateurs were swept into what was thought to be a useless part of the spectrum. We proved this to be a fallacy, so the governments took most of that away. They very kindly left us a few bands to play in, but some had strings attached. Some of these bands were shared with government-monopoly stations in some countries, the amateurs being required to give way to them. This was better than not having these bands at all. Frequencies below 30 MHz were considered to be capable of global coverage, and so were co-ordinated internationally, so even those countries who had no government stuff in these bands wrote "give way" clauses into their amateur licences.

Many of these stations with "right of way" used on-of keying and international Morse code, so to ensure that all amateurs could recognise a request to QSY or QRT, a requirement for proof of competence in Morse was included. CW Morse was also seen as a lowest-common-denominator sort of thing, with simple Q codes, to transcend language problems.

This is why Morse has been singled out for special treatment. They were good and appropriate reasons at the time, but times are changing.

Morse code is now scheduled to be withdrawn from maritime service, other users have already abandoned it in favour of automated data modes. It is likely to remain as a last ditch fallback for some services, and as a recreation of amateurs.

The reason for the Morse requirement is about to end in the next few years. I've heard rumours that one country's government sees no point in continuing it should it be removed at a future WARC (World Admin Radio Conference - The body that coordinates international radio regulations)

Should the Morse requirement go, those like me who use it will still be free to use it, those who want to will still be free to learn it. This sounds fair to me

From reading this group, I get the feeling that there are people who would lobby the FCC to keep the Morse requirement in the US, even though the FCC may no longer be required to keep it, and other countries may be quietly dropping it. I can see no reason or excuse for such behaviour.

Morse's preferential weighting was put in place by the regulators for (then) valid reasons, that are still valid today, but are about to end.

If anyone wants to campaign for better operators, then they should aim at the true target, bad operators. Encouragement and tuition will also work better than raging and flaming.

Does this help?

David GM4ZNX

(My government checked I knew enough not to get into trouble then let me loose on the bands, If I want any incentives, I must find my own)

Date: 14 Sep 93 15:00:40 EDT
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com (kevin.jessup) writes:
[deleted]

>>The licensing process is meant to test a potential licensee on all
>>aspects of amateur radio. CW is an aspect of amateur radio. Live
>>with it.

>

>CW is a form of modulation (just barely) as is AM, NFM, WFM, SSB
>or any of the digital modes. Yet in order to gain HF privileges,
>the CW form of modulation is given weight over all the others. You

Not to be pedantic (well, yes, to be pedantic), but CW as a form of modulation is not the same thing as Morse code. The test examines the candidate's skill at reading Morse code by ear. Since that ability is an operating skill often used in Amateur Radio, it is at least relevant. Whether the weight given to Morse skill is commensurate with the privileges conferred is, or should be, the proper subject of this debate.

[deleted]

>(I would be in favor of more detailed theory on the actual electronics
>involved, rather than the on-off keying of the electronics!)

What has the electronic theory to do with the question of the relevance of Morse skill?

>Why should I have to know about the actual SEQUENCE of on/off
>transitions?? Where else in amateur radio is knowledge of the
>actual encoding sequence (rather than the modulation used to CARRY
>that encoding) required? CW is NOT hardware. It is a sequence of
>switch closures used to enable the carrier.

Well, you are required to "encode" your voice identification using
the English (language) encoding scheme. To use voice modulation,
you are required to be able to use this encoding scheme. And that
skill is tested, too, as exams are given in English.

[deleted]

>Please, for the benefit of us ignorant no-coders, answer a few
>questions and provide evidence for your answers...

>

> Does knowledge of CW make one a "better" operator?

Sure. If there are two operators who have otherwise identical
skills, but one knows Morse and the other doesn't, wouldn't any
objective evaluation suggest that the one who knows Morse is
the better operator? Of course, no two operators have those
"otherwise identical skills," which moots the discussion. And
the *degree* to which the possession of the Morse skill enhances
the operator's abilities is hard to pin down.

> Does knowledge of CW make one more knowledgeable of electronic theory?

No. But this question presupposes that knowledge of electronic theory
is the sole measure of an amateur's quality. I see no justification
for that; technical knowledge is only part of the picture.

> Does knowledge of CW somehow prevent one from using profanity over
> the air?

No. Does knowledge of electronic theory? After all, if you are
going to hold the Morse requirement up to that yardstick, you have
to hold *all* of the requirements up to the same measure.

> Is knowledge of CW an indication of one's ability to learn
> more advanced electronic theory as related to RF?

Sure. Studies have found that rhesus monkeys are incapable of
learning Morse. Other studies have shown that rhesus monkeys are
incapable of learning advanced electronic theory. Ipso facto,
ability to learn Morse is an indicator of electronic learning
ability... (Yes, it's a silly answer, but it was a silly question.)

> Is knowledge of CW an indication of one's ability to learn
> the real-world practical aspects of operating an amateur
> radio station?

Sure, inasmuch as the real-world practical aspects of operating an amateur radio station can include, in part, the skill of reading Morse code. If you are suggesting that Morse skill testing should be eliminated because not everyone uses it, you must also eliminate all mode-specific material. So, *don't* put any questions about SSB excitation techniques on *my* test, 'cause I hate SSB!

> OR...
>

>Does greater knowledge of electronic theory and hands-on use of
>equipment, experimentation, antenna and equipment construction,
>along with on-the-air experience result in a better radio
>amateur?

Sure. Greater knowledge of *all* aspects of Amateur Radio, *including Morse*, is to be encouraged. That's not to say that all amateurs need to be skilled in all aspects of Amateur Radio.

>I have yet to see from any of the CW requirement proponents solid
>evidence (a scientific study by the FCC, the ARRL or any other
>reputable institution) that knowledge of CW somehow results in a
>better radio amateur.

I've seen no study that shows that technical knowledge is beneficial either. But then, I believe it's obvious that there's benefit from the possession of improved skills of all types.

>Isn't your reason for the continued requirement of CW the old "I
>did it, therefore everyone else should!" argument?

There are other reasons for arguing for the continued requirement for Morse skills. Personally, I feel the privileges attained with the skill are out of proportion to the utility of the skill. But that's a long way from saying the skill is useless.

Unfortunately, there are those who believe that Morse skill is an indication of moral quality. Likewise, there are those who believe that advanced technical knowledge is the indicator that separates the worthy from the unworthy. Since I am aware of counter examples to both theses, I consider them equally untrue.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z	jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League	
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111	

Date: 15 Sep 93 13:42:41 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!nntp.msstate.edu!olivea!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <CDE53v.Juo@hpmocsa.sqf.hp.com> dstock@hpmocsa.sqf.hp.com (David Stockton)
writes:

>kevin.jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

> <edit>

>: Some people may choose to devote their time to other skills.

...I deleted MOST of what I consider some very wise commentary by
Dave...

> The reason for the Morse requirement is about to end in the next few
>years. I've heard rumours that one country's government sees no point in
>continuing it should it be removed at a future WARC (World Admin Radio
>Conference - The body that coordinates international radio regulations)

> Should the Morse requirement go, those like me who use it will still
>be free to use it, those who want to will still be free to learn it.
>This sounds fair to me

> From reading this group, I get the feeling that there are people who
>would lobby the FCC to keep the Morse requirement in the US, even though
>the FCC may no longer be required to keep it, and other countries may be
>quietly dropping it. I can see no reason or excuse for such behaviour.

> Morse's preferential weighting was put in place by the regulators for
>(then) valid reasons, that are still valid today, but are about to end.

> If anyone wants to campaign for better operators, then they should
>aim at the true target, bad operators. Encouragement and tuition will
>also work better than raging and flaming.

> Does this help?

Yes. Very much. At least one other individual more-or-less agrees
with me. ;-))) Thanks.

> David GM4ZNX

> (My government checked I knew enough not to get into trouble then let
> me loose on the bands, If I want any incentives, I must find my own)

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 93 18:50:07 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2.radnet.com!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

: randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

:

: >

: > However....the real reliable range of those sets (vhf or uhf) is quite
: > limited, unless thru a repeater, and very few repeater groups will want a
: > nite after nite net on for the duration of time such watch groups would need.
: > So be ready for that. ok?

:

: Or...establish your OWN repeater.

:

: --Robert

OH? On what freqs? There are none left that won't QRM existing ones.

Besides... they are trying to do this on a neighborhood budget...not Clitons.

1980's

I saw (heard) a group in my area^trying to do the same thing.... and they
had their problems... resolved by setting up relay stations to relay any
NEEDED info up & down the line.

Everyone learned just what their range was, and made sure to not get out
of range....passed along any watching to the next person who'd likly be
next to see the 'suspect'.

The Equip. involved HT's (all kinds) and Car sets, and a few Home sets.
and was done on 4 simplex freqs.

Prio r to a nite of watch, they'd tell PD who was going to where/cars etc,

so PD would know they were'nt someone out to make trouble.

PROBLEM! N O W adays...with 'stalking' laws....such watch groups could be viewed as a form of stalking!

So...they'd want to check with the PD on all those issues 1st, before they start spending money on rigs that might be spent on another band...

--

Randy KA1UNW	If you get a shock while	
	servicing your equipment,	"Works for me!"
randy@192.153.4.200	DON'T JUMP!	-Peter Keyes
	You might break an expensive tube!	

Date: 14 Sep 1993 21:41:57 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!
chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wwRu0B3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>> > robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>> >>Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?

>> >> --Robert

>> myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:

>> >Isn't Form 505 no longer used?

>> > * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ

>> And besides, Form 505 doesn't point at Part 97.

>> Jim, W5GYJ

>But your proposal points to Part 95, Jim. Ten Four?

> --Robert

Awwhh, Negatorry, Good Buddy. It was actually modeled

after what happened in broadcasting when the owners
(and their NAB) convinced the FCC to make the *station*
licensee the sole point of responsibility for all
aspects of station operation.

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1993 15:20:35 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!steview@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Restrictions on antenna hght
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep14.150323.22167@bsu-ucs>, 00hmhammer@leo.bsuvcs.bsu.edu writes:

> Delaware County in Indiana has a restriction (Countywide) limiting
> antenna height to 75 feet, unless the builder seeks a license.
>
> What is the current law on this type of restriction?
>
> What are the steps suggested by conventional wisdom in challenging
> this type of restriction?
>
> Any experience out there?
>
> Howard Hammer
> 00hmhammer@bsu.edu

What are you guys gripping about! 75 feet...geesh...In most places
around here with ordinances...they come in at between 35-65 feet.
Consider yourself fortunate.

Steve KA6S

Date: 15 Sep 93 15:35:08 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2244@arrl.org>, <1993Sep15.012310.11530@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CDDuH5.L1K@news.Hawaii.Edu>gs.gov
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In article <CDDuH5.L1K@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:
|> To everyone else:

|>
|> Learning to read was a painful and tedious experience for most of us, yet
|> look at the benefits we reap and the joy we feel being able to read now. Yes,
|> we were forced to learn, a form of hazing, maybe? (Our teachers and parents
|> probably thought, "We had to learn to read, so you do too!")

Hardly comparable. Reading is a very necessary part of life and those that do not read suffer and have limited careers because of it. Code is simply a mode which should be as optional as RTTY, SSB, etc. I wouldn't want to get rid of it - I would like to see the maximum speed requirement REDUCED to 5 WPM or 13 WPM. I feel that hams should be EXPOSED to the concept, but 20 WPM can only be considered HAZING.

|>
|> Why not take that same approach to learning the code? Yes, it is painful and
|> tedious, yet once one becomes proficient, it is such a joy to use; exactly
|> the same feeling as when one finally becomes proficient in a foreign
|> language.
|>

I am happy that you and others like it. Great. But why should it be FORCED down our throats? If it is that appealing, reduce the requirement such that all hams are EXPOSED to it and let them decide for themselves whether they are interested in taking it further. Let code stand or fall on its own - let's not keep propping it up.

|> I am wondering why so many anti-code folks came into this hobby, only
|> to complain about having to learn the code; they knew in advance they
|> would have to know the code to receive the HF privileges. Very puzzling.

Please do not consider me anti-code - I may once have been, but the discussions here have convinced me that there can be a compromise. Exposure should be sufficient. Yes, I came to the hobby knowing that to advance I would have to learn code according to the CURRENT rules. I think that you are saying that since we knew it was a requirement we have no right to demand that the code requirements be changed. That type of logic does not allow for progress. I, personally, do not think that I should get HF access without being EXPOSED to code at a REASONABLE speed.

|>
|> Let me share something with you: I've just finished assembling a homebrew
|> 15 watt CW transmitter (parts taken from an old color TV I found in the
|> trash). I cannot not even begin to describe the excitement, the joy, of
|> talking to someone thousands of miles away on a transmitter I put together
|> myself, which didn't cost me a cent. I wonder if the packet operators,
|> or the SSB folks with their store-bought rigs, or those rotting up on
|> the VHF repeaters will ever experience the feelings I have with this
|> simple little xmtr. Knowing the code will open up new doors to you

|> in regards to easy-to-build, low power equipment. If there was a
|> 'fun' factor in ham radio, surely the CW homebrewers would rank the highest!
|>

I am happy for you. It's great that you enjoy that aspect of the hobby,
but not everybody does. I plan to get involved in packet, but I would
hate to see a separate UNREASONABLY TOUGH test added which got into the
nitty-gritty of packet. I read enough about it to know whether I want to
get into it, but I might actually be TURNED OFF to it if it were forced
upon me.

|> Oh, for those of you who read r.r.a.homebrew, this little 15 watt xmtr
|> will be 'project 7' as soon as I can get the schematic sketched; stay
|> tuned.
|>
|> Jeff NH6IL (with 3rd degree burns from many of my previous posts...)
|>
|>

73's

--

++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0YGT +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+

++++++

Date: 15 Sep 93 13:34:48 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!nntp.msstate.edu!olivea!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2244@arrl.org>, <1993Sep15.012310.11530@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CDDuH5.L1K@news.Hawaii.Edu>sup
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
(Jeff Herman) writes:

>>

>>Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

>Kevin, given your stance against learning the code, your signature doesn't
>really make sense; how would you know anything about DXing? You've stated
>you're a no-coder, so you've never operated on the low bands. Are you working
>DX on VHF?

DX is a "relative" term. I would define "DX" as communication over a distance regularly unattainable for the desired band/mode of operation. What is your definition and do you think that HFers are the ONLY ones who work DX?? Does operating equipment regularly capable of long distance communication somehow put you in the "elite" DX league???

>Why not take that same approach to learning the code? Yes, it is painful and
>tedious, yet once one becomes proficient, it is such a joy to use; exactly
>the same feeling as when one finally becomes proficient in a foreign
>language.

Why is it required for access to HF SSB bands? In all the posts that I and countless others have posted to this area, there has NEVER been a direct answer to that question. (Apart from international law.) Do YOU care to provide one?

>Let me share something with you: I've just finished assembling a homebrew
>15 watt CW transmitter (parts taken from an old color TV I found in the
>trash). I cannot not even begin to describe the excitement, the joy, of
>talking to someone thousands of miles away on a transmitter I put together
>myself, which didn't cost me a cent. I wonder if the packet operators,
>or the SSB folks with their store-bought rigs, or those rotting up on
>the VHF repeaters will ever experience the feelings I have with this
>simple little xmtr. Knowing the code will open up new doors to you
>in regards to easy-to-build, low power equipment. If there was a
>'fun' factor in ham radio, surely the CW homebrewers would rank the highest!

Whoopee!! Do you think the CW QRP folks have a corner on the experimentation market?? Get real!

I have a working spread-spectrum rig in the 900 MHz band. It was MUCH more difficult, time consuming, expensive and intellectually challenging than ANY CW rig ever built. BTW, I am an EE, so maybe that makes it easier for me. Regardless, HF'ers are NOT the only HAMS who design (BTW, did you DESIGN the circuit, or copy it out of QST?) and build their own equipment.

Perhaps the reason CW QRP is so popular is because the electronics is so trivial.

>Jeff NH6IL (with 3rd degree burns from many of my previous posts...)

I agree! Same here. And PLEASE, do not take any of this as a personal attack! Since this is probably the most talked about topic in amateur radio policy, I figured I'd fire-up the old flame-thrower and jump in.

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #336
